

REMARKS

This Amendment further addresses the outstanding Office Action dated September 04, 2008, in view of the Advisory Action dated December 23, 2008. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended.

By this Amendment, independent Claims 105 and 130 have been amended to more clearly recite subject matter intended to be claimed. Claims 111 and 140 have been amended to correct minor clerical errors. Claims 1-104 and 119-126 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, Claims 105-118, and 130-143 are pending.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 108 was rejected under U.S.C. §112 (first paragraph); and Claims 105-118 and 130-143 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Schubert (U.S. 2003/30069724, hereinafter “*Schubert*”).

The Office indicated in the Advisory Action of December 23, 2008 that the Applicant’s arguments presented in the Response dated December 1, 2008 regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection were persuasive and therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), without acceding thereto, Claim 105 now recites, *inter alia*, that the simulation model comprises software simulation elements each corresponding to an integrated circuit under development, wherein the integrated circuits together comprise the design of a processing machine that conforms to a functional specification of the selected configuration as defined in the configuration definition file, wherein the integrated circuits are not physically present in the processing machine. Support is provided, for example, at page 2 of Applicant’s specification.

It is apparent that the applied reference, Schubert, does not teach or suggest at least the above features of Claim 105.

For example, Schubert fails to teach or suggest a simulation model comprising software simulation elements each corresponding to an integrated circuit under development. Assuming *arguendo* that Schubert teaches generating a simulation model at all, Schubert teaches analyzing and debugging a fabricated hardware product 102 (integrated chip, system, printed circuit board, etc.). *See* Schubert, paragraphs [008], [0128], [0132]. As such, it is clear that Schubert fails to teach or suggest software simulation elements each corresponding to an integrated circuit under development, as recited in Claim 105. Furthermore, Schubert's electronic system operates in the target environment. *See* Schubert, paragraphs [0128], [0132]. Therefore, Schubert fails to teach or suggest a simulation model where the integrated circuits together comprise the design of a processing machine that conforms to a functional specification of the selected configuration as defined in the configuration definition file, and are not physically present in the processing machine, as recited in Claim 105.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 105 distinguishes patentably from Schubert.

Claim 130 also recites, *inter alia*, that the simulation model comprises software simulation elements each corresponding to an integrated circuit under development, wherein the integrated circuits together comprise the design of a processing machine that conforms to a functional specification of the selected configuration as defined in the configuration definition file, and that the integrated circuits are not physically present in the processing machine.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 130 distinguishes patentably from the applied reference for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 105.

The remaining claims are also believed to be patentable due to their respective dependence from independent Claims 105 and 130, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a prompt Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

However, should the Examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place this application in better form for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T2147-908626) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 2009

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
(703) 610-8647

By: 
Eric G. King
Reg. No. 42,736

Otilia Gabor
Reg. No. 60,217